

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT NASHVILLE**

**BRAD AMOS**

**v.**

**THE LAMPO GROUP, LLC**

)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**Case No. 3:21-cv-00923**

**Judge Richardson**

**Magistrate Judge Holmes**

**SEVENTH MODIFIED CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER**

A status/case management conference was held on October 8, 2024. Counsel participating were: Jonathan Street, Lauren Irwin, and Emily Costanza<sup>1</sup> for Plaintiff and Leslie Sanders for Defendant. From the parties' proposed modified case management order (Docket No. 174) and discussion during the status/case management conference, and after consultation with Judge Richardson, the case management schedule and plan in this case is modified as follows:

1. The parties must meet and make another substantive attempt at case resolution by **no later than October 28, 2024**. Prior to this date, the parties must exchange another round of settlement demands and responses. The parties' settlement discussion must also include whether a third mediation would be productive. The parties must, by **no later than October 31, 2024**, file a joint case resolution status report confirming this attempt at settlement. Additionally, if the parties intend to proceed with a third mediation, the joint case resolution status report must also include mediation details, specifically, who the mediator will be and when mediation will take place.


---

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Costanza has not yet entered an appearance on behalf of Plaintiff, which she must promptly do if she intends to further participate in this case on his behalf. *See* Local Rule 83.01(e)(1).

2. Given the length of time this case has been pending and the legal issues already resolved, including through appeal, the Court finds it most consistent with the directives of Fed. R. Civ. P. 1 to proceed with trial without any further dispositive motions.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, **by no later than October 21, 2024**, the parties must file a joint motion to reset the jury trial in this case with a proposed target trial date and the anticipated number of trial days.

3. No other case management is anticipated given the current status of this case.

It is SO ORDERED.

  
BARBARA D. HOLMES  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>2</sup> As counsel were advised during the October 8 status/case management conference, there are no pending motions for summary judgment, as Defendant's prior motion (Docket No. 113) was terminated upon entry of final judgment in this case (Docket Nos. 137 and 138), which was affirmed in part and reversed in part on appeal. (Docket Nos. 170 and 171). The parties' joint proposed modified case management order (Docket 175) explicitly stated that "no additional briefing for summary judgment is required." (*Id.* at ¶ 2.) They will be bound by this statement, should there be any occasion to reinstate the motion for summary judgment in this case.